

REPLY UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
GROUP ART UNIT 2168

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 8-16, 19, 22-26, 29-37, 40 and 43-51 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 6-7, 17-18, 20-21, 27-28, 38-39 and 41-42 are canceled. Independent claims 1, 12, 19, 22, 33 and 40 have been amended to incorporate features of respective canceled dependent claims and to overcome outstanding § 101 rejections.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-11, 19-32 and 40-42 stand rejected as directed to non-statutory subject matter for failure to produce a tangible result. The Examiner states in the Office Action that storing results to a computer readable medium produces a tangible result. Independent claims 1, 19, 22 and 40 are each amended to include storage of a reconciliation report to memory. Accordingly, these claims produce a tangible result and are consequently directed to statutory subject matter. Applicants therefore respectfully request withdrawal of all outstanding § 101 rejections.

Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1, 2-5, 8, 10, 12-16, 19, 22-26, 29, 31, 33-37 and 40 stand rejected under § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kucala (Pub. No. US2001/0016853A1). Claim 1 is amended to incorporate features of dependent claims 6 and 7 and to overcome the outstanding § 101 rejection. Similarly, independent claims 12, 19, 22, 33 and 40 are amended to incorporate similar features recited in dependent claims 17 and 18, 20 and 21, 27 and 28, 38 and 39, and 41 and 42, respectively. These dependent claims stood rejected as obvious over Kucala and Klein (U.S. Pat. No. 5,404,509). The rejection of these claims is now moot as these dependent claims are now canceled. Applicant

REPLY UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
GROUP ART UNIT 2168

respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1, 12, 19, 22, 33 and 40 because the cited art fails to teach or suggest all elements of these claims

For example, claim 1 recites:

storing to memory a reconciliation report, wherein the reconciliation report presents data for selected fields of the first and second data sources, and further provides a first indication if data for corresponding fields are matched and a second indication if data for corresponding fields are not matched

Neither Kucala nor Klein teaches or suggests this subject matter (See, for example, FIG. 4 of the present application). Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable. Claims 2-5 and 8-11 are allowable for at least the reasons stated above and based on their dependence from claim 1.

Independent claims 12, 19, 22, 33 and 40 are allowable for at least the reasons provided above with respect to independent claim 1. Claims 13-16 depend from claim 12, claims 23-26 and 29-32 depend from claim 22, and claims 34-37 depend from claim 33 and thus are allowable as well.

Claims 43-51 stand rejected as obvious over Kucala and Klein. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 43-51 because the cited art fails to teach or suggest all elements of these claims. For example, claim 43 recites:

retrieving a first set of data from a first data source using a first dynamic link and retrieving a second set of data from a second data source using a second dynamic link, **wherein the first and second data sources are functionally independent and the first and second sets of data are generated as a result of the same transaction**

Neither Kucala nor Klein teaches or suggests this subject matter. Kucala discloses synchronizing updates on a palmtop with "independent updates made directly on the

REPLY UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
GROUP ART UNIT 2168

PC" (paragraph 3). As such, Kucala fails to teach or suggest "first and second data sources [that] are functionally independent and . . . first and second sets of data [that] are generated as a result of the same transaction" as recited in claim 43. Klein fails to cure the deficiency of Kucala. Accordingly, claim 43 is allowable over the combination of Kucala and Klein.

Claims 44-51 are allowable for at least the reasons stated above and based on their dependence from claim 43.


Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests entry of the above amendments and favorable action in connection with this application. The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 or 1.17 to Kenyon & Kenyon LLP Deposit Account No. 11-0600. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (202) 220-4235 to discuss any matter concerning this application.

All claims are allowable. Allowance is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 27, 2006



Wesley W. Jones
(Reg. No. 56,552)

KENYON & KENYON LLP
1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: (202) 220-4200
Facsimile: (202) 220-4201